




OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

Isiah Leggett  
*County Executive*

MEMORANDUM

December 14, 2009

To: Nancy Floreen, Council President

From: Isiah Leggett, County Executive 

Subject: Planning Board Draft Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan

I am pleased to provide Executive Branch comments on the Planning Board Draft Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan. I support the overall vision of the plan to preserve the unique assets of Kensington while creating a mixed-use, pedestrian friendly town center with pedestrian and bicycle connections to surrounding neighborhoods. I commend the Planning Board and its staff for its sensitivity to preservation of the culturally rich and historic assets of Kensington.

This draft plan utilizes the proposed Commercial Residential Zone that is being developed by the Council and the Planning Board. This zone holds promise as an incentive based mixed-use zone that will encourage developers to address important policy areas in connection with proposed developments. However, I remain concerned that we are once again reviewing a plan for adoption that is predicated on a zone that does not yet exist. My staff will continue to work with M-NCPPC and Council staff on this new zone to ensure that it is effective in accomplishing its objectives to foster quality mixed-use development.

Attached to these comments is an appendix of the detailed technical comments from the Executive Branch departments that we hope your staff will find helpful in making this plan an effective tool for the future development in Kensington. The projected costs of this plan and a fiscal impact summary based on a range of development projected by Planning Board staff are also attached. The complexities of the area make it more difficult to predict the amount of redevelopment that this area will actually experience. For that reason staff has stated the potential fiscal impacts as a range.

The Sector Plan encourages the broadening of housing choices for all income levels by applying the proposed CR zone to the Town Center, both within and near the Town of Kensington. The Plan assumes that the CR zone will promote the development of more multifamily housing to achieve a better balance of single and multi-family housing options. I fully support the housing objective of the Plan. I am concerned though that the Town of Kensington has not adopted Montgomery County Code Chapter 25A which provides for

moderately priced housing and enables the Department of Housing and Community Affairs to administer the marketing, sale, rental, resale, and control of MPDUs. Without this authority the goal of broadening housing choices for an array of incomes may not be achieved.

Depending on the amount of residential development that actually occurs, the area could realize a growth in the student population ranging between 57 and 171 additional school children. The Plan does not recommend an additional school for students arising out of development in the Plan area, but mentions that Kensington Elementary may be needed to accommodate White Flint Sector Plan development. Montgomery County Public Schools should address the validity of these assumptions.

The Kensington Plan Area is sandwiched between the White Flint Sector Plan area and the Wheaton Central Business District. While the draft Plan assumes that improvements to MARC rail will reduce vehicle trips, there is no discussion of what these improvements may be. The Plan also identifies that the intersections of Connecticut Avenue and Pylers Mill and Connecticut Avenue and Knowles Avenue will be out of balance for local area review. Given the trips that will be generated by redevelopment in the adjoining sectors, there needs to be an understanding of what transportation impacts there will be and a better vision of how MARC and other measures will reduce vehicle trips.

The Plan recommends re-evaluating the boundaries of the Historic District and identifies some key areas for inclusion in the Historic District. I am pleased that the Plan is sensitive to these areas and I encourage greater attention to Historic Preservation in the draft Plan.

I hope these comments and the attached technical comments are helpful to the Council as it considers the draft Town of Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan. The Executive Branch is committed to working with the Council, the Town of Kensington, and the Planning Board on the Kensington Sector Plan and its future implementation.

Attachments: Technical Comments  
Summary of Fiscal Impact Scenarios  
Operating Cost Estimates

**Montgomery County Departmental Technical Comments on  
Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan  
October 2009 Planning Board Draft**

<b>Department of Economic Development.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Department of Environmental Protection.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Department of Fire and Rescue Services.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Department of Health and Human Services.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Department of Housing and Community Affairs.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Department of Public Libraries.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Department of Transportation.....</b>	<b>15</b>

## **Department of Economic Development Comments on the Planning Board Draft Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan**

### General

- Many of the graphics (in particular some of the maps showing proposed zoning changes) are too small to read. Suggest that they be enlarged so that they can effectively illustrate the companion text.

### Recommendations section

- No reference to zoning changes. Since the plan proposes to rezone a significant portion of the Plan area to the new CR zone, this should be included as a key bullet in the Recommendations section. It might also be useful to move the existing and proposed zoning maps on pages 31-33 to this section.
- Suggest amending first bullet in Diversity subsection to read: 'Creating an active Town Center with new residential *and neighborhood-serving retail* uses.'

### Area-wide Recommendations section

- The Stormwater Management subsection recommends using the CR zones to provide incentives for 'green' landscaping options. This is the first reference in the report to the CR zone. As noted above, the plan's recommendation to rezone a large portion of the Plan area needs to be noted earlier in the Recommendations section.
- CR zone is variously referred to as CR or C-R.
- Some of the language in the Diversity subsection is a little unclear:
  - "The new district will allow commercial and residential uses to be mixed at varying densities that will be determined by individual property owners." This is not entirely accurate. Assuming that property owners go through optional method development, the exact densities and building heights will be based on the level of public amenities they are willing to provide and their negotiations with the Planning Board.
  - "This Plan makes three recommendations for properties and areas under study: total FAR, non-residential and residential FAR, and building height." The fact that these are the three key components of the CR zone is not explained until the Implementation section.

### Town Center section

- Last sentence, second paragraph, reads "This Plan encourages the retention of existing businesses' but does not explain how.

### Crafts/Services District section

- DED supports the Plan's recommendation to retain the current I-1 zoning for the West Howard Avenue portion of this district, which is home to a number of regionally renowned antique shops, furniture restoration businesses, and art studios. DED also supports the Plan's recommendations for streetscaping and stormwater management upgrades to West Howard Avenue, which are needed to enhance its draw as a regional destination and improve environmental sustainability.

#### Metropolitan Avenue Area section

- 3700 Plyers Mill Road LLC Property subsection does not indicate what zoning is being recommended. Also, it references “..an existing one-family neighborhood.” Should this read “a neighborhood of single family homes”?
- Stubbs Property subsection does not indicate what zoning is being recommended.

#### Implementation section:

- Zoning subsection: Paragraph three indicates that the CR zone’s standard method limits overall density to .5 FAR. Since the CR zone has not yet been adopted by the County Council and the FAR ceiling under standard method development is still being discussed, suggest striking this sentence.
- Public Schools subsection is a little confusing.
- Libraries subsection states ‘This Plan recognizes that land use recommendations in White Flint may have an impact on demand at Kensington Park Library.’ Isn’t a satellite library being recommended in the White Flint Sector Plan?

## **Department of Environmental Protection Comments on the Planning Board Draft Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan**

Many of these comments were included in DEP's comments on the July 2009 Public Hearing Draft of the Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan.

1. General: The sector plan still does not discuss in any manner the water and sewer systems providing service for the sector plan area, or include any related discussion concerning the Water and Sewer Plan and its designation of community (public) service for the sector plan area. The plan should indicate whether proposed redevelopment will require replacement of water and/or sewer infrastructure in or around the plan area.
2. Page 14, bullets under Environment Paragraph: The document states that "A high priority should be placed on the following goals:
  - reducing the amount of impervious surfaces
  - treating stormwater runoff with environmentally sensitive design (ESD) or low impact development (LID)"

There is nothing specific in the plan that emphasizes reducing impervious surfaces. It appears to be the same high density/high impervious land use plan that has been used in the past for other Central Business District areas. There are no additional green space requirements and no options to allow for greater building heights (but maintaining the same FAR) in exchange for green space.

Treating stormwater runoff with ESD or LID is more than a priority; it is now a regulatory mandate under the state's new stormwater management regulations. The document should acknowledge this.

3. Page 14, bullets under Stormwater Management: Kensington residents already pay the Water Quality Protection Charge (WQPC). If projects in Kensington are to be funded out of the Water Quality Protection Fund (WQPF), they would be prioritized along with other needs Countywide and implemented based on the priority list.

This section refers to incorporating "open section roadway swales rather than conventional curbs" and designing sidewalks that "disconnect runoff from conventional storm drain systems." Neither of these is shown in the typical design standards for streets.

This section also encourages the use of the CR Zone to provide incentives for a variety of landscaping options for stormwater management. As noted previously, many of the techniques described are now required as part of the state's new stormwater regulations, so incentives should not be awarded for implementing them.

DEP has a program to undertake roadway Low Impact Development (LID) projects that would be funded by the WQPF. The currently identified projects are not within the Kensington Sector Plan area. As DEP moves forward with a systematic implementation of roadway LID, County roadways within Kensington will be prioritized along with other County roads. Roadway LID projects in Kensington could be undertaken through other funding sources.

4. Page 15, last bullet under Environmental Sustainability: The statement should be expanded to include specific goals for tree canopy. Suggest rewording the bullet to read "Increase tree canopy cover along streets and within medians, within existing neighborhoods, commercial areas, and on parkland *to meet or exceed the American Forests recommendations for canopy coverage.*" These recommendations can be found at [www.americanforests.org/resources/urbanforests/treedeficit.php](http://www.americanforests.org/resources/urbanforests/treedeficit.php), and were included in 2009 Climate Protection Plan for Montgomery County (<http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/content/dep/Sustainability/2009mococlimprotplan.pdf>, page 77).
5. Page 24, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet under Silver Creek: Removal of the concrete channel in Silver Creek would be an extremely low priority for DEP's stream restoration program because of downstream fish barriers, higher priority given to restoration of natural channels and extremely high cost.

## **Department of Fire and Rescue Comments on the Planning Board Draft Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan**

MCFRS comments generally pertain to the draft plan's lack of recognition of fire-rescue needs and requirements. As was the case with the previous draft, impacts of the plan's recommendations on fire department access, response time, and load bearing requirements of roadways and access ways with relation to heavy fire-rescue apparatus have not been addressed in the plan. In the attachment to this memorandum, I offer specific comments related to these concerns.

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

#### Fire-Rescue Facility/Resource Needs

**Page:** 29

**Excerpt:** "No additional [public] facilities would be needed to accommodate the development proposed in this Plan."

**Comment:** The draft plan does not provide the estimated number of additional commercial square feet and additional number of dwelling units associated with residential development. Furthermore, no study has been conducted to confirm that the local fire station (i.e., Kensington Volunteer Fire Department Station #5) is adequately staffed and equipped to handle additional fire and EMS incident call load associated with proposed development. While the station itself is likely to remain adequate, the resources deployed at the station might be inadequate to accommodate the additional call load associated with proposed development and occupants.

#### Urban Design Guidelines

**Page:** 28

**Excerpt:** "Urban design guidelines will provide specifics on street classifications, types and functions, building form, orientation and massing, and open space."

**Comment:** Input and review of the design guidelines by impacted departments/agencies is imperative for cohesive implementation.

#### Street Oriented Development

**Pages:** 11

**Excerpts:** "Minimize conflicts with motorists, transit buses, and pedestrians through low target speeds for vehicles, access management, and reduced curb cuts."

**Comment:** These items must be balanced with service needs for the community. Low target speeds increase emergency vehicle response time, while access management and reduced curb cuts, if not properly implemented, have the potential to reduce emergency services access to buildings and their occupants.

#### Pedestrian-oriented Urban Design

**Pages:** 1, 8, 9

**Excerpts:** "pedestrian friendly connections," "give pedestrians priority," "encourage pedestrian-centered urban design," "streets should be safe, pedestrian-oriented environments," "narrower urban road sections"



**Comment:** “Pedestrian-friendly” and similar phrases typically translate to reduced fire-rescue service access due to narrow streets, intersections with tight turning radii, and poor access to and around buildings. Narrow streets and tight turning radii delay emergency response, and poor access to and around buildings prevent or adversely impact the proper tactical positioning of fire-rescue vehicles. Pedestrian-oriented design is achievable provided that fire-rescue access requirements are adequately addressed.

#### Curb Cuts

**Page:** 11

**Excerpt:** “Minimize curb cuts to reduce conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles.”

**Comment:** Sufficient and adequate access points to and around buildings - made possible by curb cuts - must be provided and be as unrestricted as possible to allow access by fire-rescue vehicles. This is particularly important to the proper tactical positioning of large fire apparatus (i.e., pumpers and aerial units) around buildings to execute fire suppression operations and exterior rescues).

#### On-Street Parking

**Page:** 11

**Excerpt:** “encourage on-street parking”

**Comment:** Recent M-NCPPC practice, in an effort to encourage on-street parking, has allowed on-street parking to count toward required parking minimums. If on-street parking is necessary to achieve parking minimums, then there is no overflow parking available, thus creating opportunity for parking infractions that often lead to restricted emergency vehicle access.

#### Reduced Road Speed and Traffic Choke Points

**Page:** 9

**Excerpts:** “Reduce target speed of Connecticut Avenue to 30 mph,” “refrain from widening roadway intersections to accommodate through-vehicle traffic”

**Comment:** Connecticut Avenue is a major thoroughfare. Arbitrarily lowering the speed limit and restricting needed intersection improvements will create major choke points in Kensington significantly affecting response time of fire-rescue vehicles.

#### Permeable Pavement

**Page:** 14

**Excerpt:** “Use, where feasible, permeable paving for roads, road shoulders, parking lots, and parking lanes”

**Comment:** Permeable surfaces are not conducive to supporting the high load-bearing requirements of heavy fire-rescue apparatus. Any road surface that could be used by fire-rescue vehicles for travel or positioning must be of sufficient load bearing capacity to support fire-rescue vehicles weighing up to 80,000 pounds. Any permeable surfaces that might be permitted must be on a structural sub-grade to support heavy vehicles.

#### Road Widths

**Pages:** 9, 38

**Excerpts/References:** “refrain from widening roadway intersections,” and the “Master Plan of Highways Roadway Classifications” table

**Comment:** The proposed recommendations concerning road width as proposed on page 9 will significantly slow response time of fire-rescue vehicles. The table on page 38 proposes cross sections for public roadways in Kensington. MCFRS has not been given the opportunity to participate in any analysis of whether the proposed cross sections will accommodate both traffic volume and timely emergency response.

#### Street Trees

**Pages:** 11 (plan), 47 (appendix)

**Excerpts:** “provide street trees,” “street tree planting,” “street trees providing canopy and landscaping on all streets”

**Comment:** Size, height, and spacing of street trees must allow adequate access for the positioning of aerial ladders and ground ladders to building windows, particularly where buildings are over 3 stories in height. Poorly placed trees greatly restrict aerial apparatus operations at taller buildings. Tree location and density must be strategically planned to minimize these conflicts.

## **Department of Health and Human Services Comments on the Planning Board Draft Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan**

### Walkability

The Department agrees with the recommendation for creating new ways for townspeople to move car-free (safely and efficiently) throughout the Town, including the Town Center. A more walkable community is likely to be a healthier community. Walkability ties in to obesity avoidance/reduction, physical fitness, and other cardiovascular benefits.

However, the Department also acknowledges the challenge faced by planners and those stakeholders who are seeking to reduce dependence on cars. The draft cites an existing auto-centric commercial center. The proposed commercial-residential (CR) zoning (mixed land use) is likely part of the solution.

### Transportation

Because public health, land use, and transportation are interconnected, we would like to see in the plan additional considerations for increasing and, if necessary, redirecting public transportation. Expanded alternatives to car transportation and the resultant reductions in carbon emissions will positively impact air quality, an important consideration for public health. We recommend the inclusion of public health outcomes measures, such as those that involve more healthful air, for transportation projects in order to highlight these connections.

The Department endorses the value of medians as pedestrian refuges at intersections to shorten crosswalk distances. This particularly helps meet the needs of senior and disabled crossers. Providing longer green light/walk cycles or building under or over passes are other options for ensuring comfortable crossing for pedestrians.

### Recreational Opportunities

The Department notes the CR requirement for development of public use space, which may include active recreation space, as a public amenity. Exercise and workout routines, facilitated by recreation and fitness facilities, have been proven to improve quality of life, reduce stress level and enhance emotional wellbeing for residents.

Should the HOC relocate its Kensington administrative offices, the use of that property for community recreation (informal play and exercise) could greatly benefit Kensington residents, particularly children and families. We also endorse the importance of increasing neighborhood connectivity to walkable areas, bikeways, trails, and parkland through sidewalks and other means.

### New Development

The draft plan hypothesizes that the Town Center will add 267 units of residential housing, with an additional 237 units outside of Town Center. These 504 units would increase the number of existing residential units by 47% (calculated from figures cited in the report). This increase could result in changed demographics that may have implications for human services.

A new look at population characteristics (e.g., young children, seniors, etc.), and how needs will change after the hypothetical expansion and the “push and pull” factors in the final plan, will be required. According to 2000 Census data, compared to all contiguous Zip Codes, 20895 has the highest percentage of its residents earning in both the \$50K-75K and the \$75K-100K ranges. It also has the lowest percentage of persons living below the poverty line. These figures may change with the additional Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit capacity envisioned in the plan.

The hypothetical increase of 139,000 square feet of commercial space in the CR districts provides an opportunity to meet the increasing need and demand from the County’s aging population for high density housing near healthful food stores, pharmacies, and medical offices. Businesses that cater to visitors without meeting the needs of local residents will detract from the value of mixed use development.

#### Socialization

A primary need for the senior population involves design features that facilitate the ability for people to interact and engage with other people (both other seniors and non-seniors). The closest senior center to the Kensington Sector is Holiday Park. There should be consideration or provisions for ensuring transportation to Holiday Park. To the extent that the Kensington library is a hub for social engagement and interaction, it should be navigable from all new and existing housing in the Sector for seniors and others with mobility devices.

#### Community Gardens

The Department is pleased to note the multiple mentions of community gardens in neighborhoods. Among other environmental and community-building benefits, gardens increase the likelihood that residents will reap the nutritional benefits of having locally-grown fresh fruits and vegetables as staples of their diets.

**Department of Housing and Community Affairs Comments on the  
Planning Board Draft Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan**

The Department of Housing and Community Affairs has reviewed the Planning Board Draft Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan. DHCA supports the Plan's vision that the Kensington Town Center will "broaden housing choices for an array of ages and income," and the recommendation under Diversity of "creating an active Town Center with new residential uses."

The Plan appears to encourage the goal of broadening housing choices for all income levels by applying the proposed CR zone to the Town Center, both within and near the Town of Kensington. The Plan indicates that the CR zone will promote the development of more multifamily housing.

There is a point regarding this matter that remains to be resolved. The County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 59 of the County Code, applies in the Town of Kensington, so the new CR Zone will apply in the incorporated area. The Town of Kensington, however, has not adopted Code Chapter 25A, Housing, Moderately Priced. Even if MPDUs are produced by new development in the Town, the Department of Housing and Community Affairs lacks the authority to administer the marketing, sale, rental, resale, and control of MPDUs within the Town of Kensington.

DHCA supports the application of the CR zone to the Town Center, but conditions that support on two important factors:

- Sufficient residential densities should be required in the CR zone to provide for multifamily residential development, including MPDUs.
- Developments within the incorporated Town of Kensington that have an MPDU requirement must enter into an agreement with the County to permit the County's administration of the units in a manner similar to the administration of MPDUs elsewhere. This agreement should be entered into prior to the issuance of building permits for the development and should be recorded in the land records as a covenant on the property

Other than providing the required affordable housing in the redevelopment of the Town Center, the Plan makes no recommendations for increasing the amount of affordable housing in the Plan area. In keeping with the recommendations of the County Executive's Affordable Housing Task Force, DHCA again requests that the following recommendations be added to the plan:

- Affordable housing should be considered as part of the reuse or redevelopment of any publicly owned sites in Kensington Sector Plan Area.
- Affordable housing should be evaluated as a supplemental use on the site of any public facility that may be constructed in the Plan Area.

The Sector Plan should also include a numeric affordable housing target for the redevelopment that takes place in the Plan Area.

DHCA, as noted on page 29 of the draft Plan, has been working on a plan for streetscape, building façade, and stormwater management (SWM) improvements for West Howard Avenue. The redevelopment of the State Highway Administration (SHA) site on West Howard Avenue may allow some SWM improvements to be incorporated on the site, but additional SWM improvements will be needed between the SHA site and Rock Creek. DHCA requests that the plan allow consideration for the location of such SWM improvements in Rock Creek Park due to the steep slope of West Howard Avenue and the high degree of impervious surfaces along the street and the properties it serves. Given the multiple owners along West Howard Avenue, and their lack of agreement on redevelopment of the area, DHCA is not planning on pursuing any capital projects in the area at this time.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this draft plan. If you have any questions about these recommendations, please contact Scott Reilly, Chief Operating Officer, at 240-777-3640 or [scott.reilly@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:scott.reilly@montgomerycountymd.gov).

## **Department of Public Libraries Comments on the Planning Board Draft Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan**

The Planning Board draft document mentions libraries in two areas – Open Space System on page 13 and Libraries on page 29.

The Open Space System comments indicate that unused green space behind the library parking should be contemplated for public space and stormwater expansion but should take into consideration any future library expansion plans. If the Sector plan is suggesting that green space and stormwater expansion for the Town of Kensington be considered for the library lot, the Department would have concerns about multi jurisdictional use of the property, which I am sure DEP and Parks might also echo. If the comments relate to stormwater management and open space for the library's use, the Department states again that DEP is in the final planning stages of a project that will locate Low Impact Design (LID) stormwater management practices on the unused green spaces of the library's parking lot including 2 rain gardens, 2 rain gardens/infiltration trenches, 2 tree boxes, and street tree plantings. Construction is planned to start late spring 2010 and be completed by mid summer 2010. So the Sector plan's recommendation is already being implemented.

The Library section on page 29 includes information on both the Kensington Park and Noyes Libraries and mentions the impact on future renovation plans for Kensington Park of the White Flint sector plan. The Department previously indicated that future plans for the Noyes Library may change the focus and purpose of the one room historic structure and thus might impact parking. Earlier this summer, the Town of Kensington put up no parking signs around the Montgomery Avenue circle, which significantly impacted the locations where library customers could park until a call to the Town identified the erection of the signs as a mistake. If the Library Department changes the mission of the Noyes Library, the need for some additional parking spaces may arise. Approximately 10 cars can now park around the triangle where the library is located. The need for daytime and possible evening visitor parking around the library and on nearby streets must continue to be considered as the street grid for the plan is discussed and implemented.

The plan also calls for the extension of Summit Avenue from Plyers Mill Road to Connecticut Avenue (page 23 of the draft plan and page 41 of the Appendix). The Department has concerns about implementation of this recommendation due to the current traffic patterns that result in cars that cut through the library's parking lot to avoid the intersection/ traffic backups at Summit and Knowles as well as at Connecticut and Plyers Mill (other end of Summit). The Department is concerned that use of the library's parking lot as a shortcut could worsen if Summit Ave is improved and extended.

Finally, the library's property fronting Knowles lacks a sidewalk along the north side of the street between the driveway and the next property to the east. There is a sidewalk on the hilly portion of the actual library property which runs the length of the building and

drops down again to Knowles at the far eastern end, but we have been asked to provide a sidewalk on the street itself in light of ADA and other access concerns.



**Montgomery County Department of Transportation Comments on  
Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan – Planning Board Draft  
(MNCPPC, October 2009)**

The Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) has the following concerns and comments regarding the subject draft plan.

General Concerns

1. The planning area covered by this draft contains territory for both an incorporated municipality (Town of Kensington) and several unincorporated areas (Montgomery County). The text should differentiate between incorporated and unincorporated areas, particularly where implementation of plan recommendations will be done by different governmental bodies.
2. Kensington is located midway between White Flint and the Wheaton CBD, two other areas currently undergoing plan amendments. East-west travel between these three areas will increase and the plan draft acknowledges that Kensington is already a bottleneck between the other two but it does not recommend any comprehensive solutions supported by transportation analysis. Intersections along the two major arterials in the plan area (MD 185 and MD 193) should be reviewed for existing and future (build-out) conditions in terms of a Critical Lane Volume analysis. If failing levels of service are indicated, some form of remedy consistent with land use/transportation balance should be proposed. It is unacceptable to state, “Refrain from widening intersections to accommodate through vehicle traffic” (p. 14) without proposing another specific solution.
3. More emphasis needs to be given to the MARC station within the planning area. The station has played a major role in the development of Kensington and the plan should recognize this role and project how the commuter service can be used to help accomplish the plan vision. There is no discussion as to how the presence of the station, and commuter train service, can leverage development and aid in achieving transit modal shares. There also needs to be an analysis of how much commuter parking is existing (the station currently has 125 – 150 daily boardings) and how much additional parking might be needed to support higher ridership.
4. The extension of Summit Avenue is shown as going through (taking) the current Town of Kensington public works facility. This plan must propose an alternative site for the relocation of this facility and must include text that the Town will relocate this facility at its own cost and in advance of the implementation of the road.
5. Bikeway M-M’ (as shown in the Kensington Wheaton Master Plan) is not shown on this plan draft; either show it on the map on p. 38 and add it to the bikeway table, or add some text formally deleting it so there is no future confusion as to its status.

6. A bikeway should be proposed for University Boulevard (MD 193) within the planning area.
7. A discussion of the jobs to housing ratio is missing from this plan and needs to be addressed so that there is a clear understanding of how this sector will compare with the countywide ratio of 1.6 to 1.
8. The historic preservation sections are insufficient and incomplete. Since this is a comprehensive amendment, a full historic preservation analysis of each candidate site or district needs to be done as part of this plan update, including a determination as to whether the site or district should be added to the Master Plan for Historic Preservation, retained on the Locational Atlas, or deleted from the Locational Atlas. It is insufficient to simply identify potential candidates for future evaluation.
9. It is unclear to MCDOT whether this Plan should be evaluated solely subject to the provisions of Article 66B of the Maryland Code (since it is a plan predominantly for a municipality) or subject to the provisions of Article 66B and Article 28 (since the plan includes a minor amount of unincorporated Montgomery County territory as well). The Plan needs to contain at least a brief description of the legal roles of the Park and Planning Commission, the Town of Kensington Council, and the Montgomery County Council for the approval and adoption process of the plan and zoning authority during implementation.

#### Specific Comments

- p. i change the lower case “diversity” (page 19) to **districts**
- p. 1 under “Vision”, the plan should not be recommending additional areas and sites for historic preservation evaluation; as a comprehensive amendment it should include complete evaluations and determinations for all candidate sites or districts
- p. 3 the first paragraph states that “The east-west crossing requires many travelers to use Connecticut Avenue . . .”. This is incorrect since travelers may use Summit Avenue instead.
- the third paragraph states that “. . . the track crossing is inconvenient and inhospitable”; this is incorrect since the track crossing is not a pedestrian connection; it is only for use by MARC passengers within the station area
- the fourth paragraph states “. . . businesses and [sic] well as plumbers, . . .”, change “and” to “as”
- p. 4 clarify whether this is the local, or National Register, historic district in the figure title and legend
- show all proposed streets

- p. 9                revise the sixth bullet by adding “at appropriate locations” after  
“pedestrian crosswalks”
  
- p. 10             this figure needs a legend to explain what the different colors mean
- show Kensington town boundary
  
- p. 12             this Historic Preservation section needs to be completely rewritten to  
include evaluations of all candidate historic sites and districts and  
determinations as to whether they should be designated as historic or not
  
- p. 13             delete the third bullet symbol at the bottom of the page; it is superfluous
  
- p. 14             the second bullet under Stormwater Management is proposing a section  
that is not in the County’s design standards and is therefore invalid in the  
unincorporated areas of the plan
- the third bullet under Stormwater Management is proposing permeable  
paving for roads which is not currently permitted by the County and is  
therefore invalid in the unincorporated areas of the plan
  
- p. 15             change all references from Lexington Avenue to Lexington Street
- delete “County” from the third (Plyers Mill Road) line in the Table; this is  
a Town street not operated by the County
  
- p. 18             why is this page blank?
  
- p. 19             the heading “diversity” should be changed to **districts**
  
- p. 20             the third bullet at the top of the page is proposing a median design that is  
not in the County’s design standards and is therefore invalid in the  
unincorporated areas of the plan
- clarify in the “Concept” section the meaning of “continuous pedestrian  
street” so that there is no confusion that it is a Business District Street  
open to vehicular travel
- in the third bullet under “Connectivity” add the limits of “from  
Connecticut Avenue to Nash Place” after Dupont Avenue for consistency  
with the figure on page 37 and the table on page 38
  
- p. 22             show all proposed streets
  
- p. 27             Ken-Gar should be evaluated as a historic site or district as part of this  
plan, and a determination made as to whether to designate it or not
  
- p. 29             under Capital Improvements, any transportation projects in the  
unincorporated areas of the plan need to be coordinated with MCDOT

- p. 30 show all proposed streets
- p. 32 show all proposed streets
- p. 34 show all proposed streets
- "LB-5" is inconsistent with the table on p. 36
  - "SR-17" is inconsistent with the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan, which shows it going via Dupont and Nash
  - Bikeway "SR-24" should be extended to bikeway "SR-16" for transportation interconnectivity
  - "LB-2" should be continued easterly to "LB-6" and should only be shown on one alignment (either A or B) with no asterisk
  - "LB-4" should be continued westerly to "SR-54" via Calvert Place and Prospect Street
  - add a bikeway on Howard Avenue from Summit Avenue to Connecticut Avenue
  - what are BL-100 and BL-101? They do not appear in the Countywide Bikeways Master Plan, nor are they shown on the table on page 35 of this plan draft
- p. 35 Bikeway "SR-16" should be referenced in the table since it is shown on the figure on p. 38 and a portion of it is within the Sector Plan Area
- an additional separate bridge for pedestrians and bicyclists is recommended over the CSX along the west side of Connecticut Avenue as part of Bikeway SR-17
- p. 36 redesignate all route numbers as "LB-xx"
- an additional segment of "LB-1" is recommended from Knowles Avenue to Howard Avenue
  - "LB-5" is inconsistent with the figure on p. 34
  - Bikeway M-M' (as shown in the Kensington Wheaton Master Plan) is not shown on this plan draft; either show it on the map on p. 34 and add it to this table, or add some text formally deleting it so there is no future confusion as to its status
  - "LB-2" should extend to St. Paul Street rather than Connecticut Avenue
  - "LB-4" should extend to Summit Avenue rather than Kensington Parkway
  - add a bikeway on Howard Avenue from Summit Avenue to Connecticut Avenue
- p. 37 only show one alignment for B-3 (either A or B) and delete the asterisk and footnote; the latter is superfluous
- p. 38 all of Arterial A-62 should have a R-O-W of 100' to be consistent with the previous plan

- Arterial A-67 should have 4 travel lanes to be consistent with the previous plan
- additional right-of-way is recommended for MD 185 so it can accommodate Proposed Bikeways B-1 and SR-17
- B-1 should have a R-O-W of 80' to be consistent with the previous plan
- B-4 should only go to the Plan Boundary (not to Capitol View Ave) to be internally consistent
- B-5 should be named Lexington Street (not Ave) extension; also the one travel lane is internally inconsistent with the on road bikeway
- B-6 should have a R-O-W of 80' to be consistent with the previous plan
- B-7 should have a R-O-W of 70' to be consistent with the text on p. 20
- B-8 should have a R-O-W of 80' to be consistent with the previous plan
- B-9 should have a R-O-W of 80' to be consistent with the previous plan
- B-10 should have a R-O-W of 70' to be consistent with the text on p. 20
- Primary Residential Street P-2 needs proper and accurate Limits
- Primary Residential Street P-4 needs proper and accurate Limits
- the second bullet under "Notes" should state Lexington Street (not Avenue) extension
- the third bullet under "Notes" is inconsistent with the historic district boundary shown in the figure on p. 4
- it would be helpful to document the existing right-of-way widths in this table

**Fiscal Impact Analysis for the Kensington Sector Plan**  
**Summary of Fiscal Impact Scenarios**

**Summary:** Below are 6 fiscal impact scenarios that attempt to show the range of development possibilities that could follow from the enactment of the Kensington and Vicinity Master Plan. They are based on the County's Economic Development Fund Fiscal Impact Model, and represent a broad-brush look at the higher level revenues and expenditures, rather than being all-inclusive. The figures do not include additional CIP expenditures, which will follow in a separate document. These scenarios represent the relative extremes of the fiscal impact spectrum, based on there being at least some minimal amount of new development.

Scenarios					
Residential and Commercial Development		Commercial Development Only		Residential Development Only	
New Residential and Commercial FAR is Minimal	New Residential and Commercial FAR is Maximal	New Commercial FAR is Minimal	New Commercial FAR is Maximal	New Residential FAR is Minimal	New Residential FAR is Maximal

**THE NEW DEVELOPMENT**

Estimated New Commercial FAR Assessed Value	\$41,755,000	\$124,650,500	\$41,755,000	\$124,650,500		
Estimated Value of Personal Property	\$4,175,500	\$12,465,050	\$4,175,500	\$12,465,050		
Real Property Tax rate at location	\$0.91	\$0.91	\$0.91	\$0.91		
Personal Property Tax rate at location	\$2.28	\$2.28	\$2.28	\$2.28		
Number of Jobs in New Commercial Space	2,088	6,233	2,088	6,233		
Average Salary per New Job	\$72,012	\$72,012	\$72,012	\$72,012		
Income Tax per new job	\$1,728	\$1,728	\$1,728	\$1,728		
Estimated New Residential FAR Assessed Value	\$75,800,000	\$227,300,909			\$75,800,000	\$227,300,909
Real Property Tax Rate	\$0.91	\$0.91			\$0.91	\$0.91

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

Net new households	379	1,137			379	1,137
New Population	963	2,868			963	2,868
Additional Schoolchildren	57	171			57	171
Additional College Students	8	23			8	23
Number of new jobs	2,088	6,233	2,088	6,233		
% of Jobs County Residents	60%	60%	60%	60%		
Net new jobs are County residents	1,253	3,740	1,253	3,740		

**REVENUES**

<b>Property Tax Revenues</b>						
From Primary Investment	\$476,466	\$1,422,387	\$476,466	\$1,422,387		
From Secondary Investment	\$692,054	\$2,075,257			\$692,054	\$2,075,257
<b>Income Tax Revenues</b>						
From Primary Income	\$655,021	\$1,965,063			\$655,021	\$1,965,063
From Secondary Income	\$210,331	\$630,992			\$210,331	\$630,992
<b>Energy &amp; Telephone Taxes</b>						
	\$396,733	\$1,186,795	\$231,264	\$690,388	\$165,469	\$496,407
<b>Other Job Related Revenues</b>						
	\$104,387	\$311,935	\$83,216	\$248,424	\$21,170	\$63,511
<b>Other Population Related Revenues</b>						
	\$221,755	\$665,265			\$221,755	\$665,265
<b>Total County Revenues</b>	<b>\$2,756,746</b>	<b>\$8,257,694</b>	<b>\$790,946</b>	<b>\$2,361,199</b>	<b>\$1,965,800</b>	<b>\$5,896,495</b>

**COSTS OF COUNTY SERVICE**

Population related costs	\$920,757	\$2,762,270	\$0	\$0	\$920,757	\$2,762,270
Job related costs	\$673,808	\$2,015,955	\$371,745	\$1,109,763	\$302,064	\$906,191
Schoolchildren costs	\$817,377	\$2,452,131	\$0	\$0	\$817,377	\$2,452,131
College student costs	\$66,184	\$198,551	\$0	\$0	\$66,184	\$198,551
<b>Total County Service Costs</b>	<b>\$2,478,125</b>	<b>\$7,428,905</b>	<b>\$371,745</b>	<b>\$1,109,763</b>	<b>\$2,106,381</b>	<b>\$6,319,142</b>

**TOTAL FISCAL IMPACT of the COMPANY**

<b>(Revenues Less Costs)</b>	<b>\$278,621</b>	<b>\$828,789</b>	<b>\$419,202</b>	<b>\$1,251,436</b>	<b>(\$140,581)</b>	<b>(\$422,647)</b>
------------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

**Assumptions**

1. New Commercial Development based on data from Planning staff.
2. Assessed value of new commercial development is based on \$100 per square foot of valuation.
3. New residential development based on data from Planning staff.
4. Assessed value of new residential development is based on \$200,000 per unit valuation.
  - because the Planning Board Draft notes that most of the new units will be in multi-family housing.
  - current countywide average for condominium units is nearly \$250,000 (these typically have higher assessed values than non-cond multifamily housing)
5. Revenues and Service Costs are based on FY10 Approved Budget figures calculated on a unit of population basis

**County Capital and Operating Cost Estimates  
Assumed to be Incurred as a Result of the  
Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan**

<b>Capital Improvement Projects</b>			
<b>Project</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Cost Estimate</b>	<b>Implem. Dept.</b>
<b>Business District Streets</b>			
Summit Avenue Extension	Plyers Mill Rd. to Farragut Ave. (to Connecticut Ave.)	\$10,000,000	DOT
Lexington Street Extension	Metropolitan Ave. to Plyers Mill Rd.	\$6,000,000	DOT
<b>Public Facilities</b>			
Full Service Community Recreation Center	Utilizing the complete program of requirements (33,000 nsf, 4 athletic fields, playcourt, playground, 190 car parking)	\$31,400,000	DGS
<b>Subtotal – Capital Improvement Projects</b>		<b>\$47,400,000</b>	
<b>Operating Budget Impacts</b>			
Additional staffing and operating expenses for new Recreation Center	Cost estimate includes personnel (\$328,000, 6.5WYs); operating (\$404,000)	\$732,000	REC
<b>Subtotal – Operating Budget Impacts</b>		<b>\$732,000</b>	
<b>Total Cost Estimate</b>		<b>\$48,132,000</b>	

**Notes and assumptions:**

**Business District Streets:**

- Cost estimates were prepared using master plan level of information, no engineering has been done;
- Costs represent 2009 dollars with a +/- 50% level of accuracy.
- Since Kensington is a separate municipality with its own public works capability, there is uncertainty as to who would construct and who would fund the proposed improvements (State, County or Town).

**Stormwater Management:**

- Kensington accepted the storm drain system from WSSC in the 1960s and has not been paying the storm drain property tax. Kensington is responsible for repair or replacement of the culvert under Oberon Street.
- Kensington residents pay the Water Quality Protection Charge (WQPC). Therefore, projects in Kensington can be funded out of the Water Quality Protection Fund (WQPF) and would be prioritized along with other needs Countywide and implemented based on the priority list.

**Libraries:**

- The White Flint Sector Plan calls for a public transportation oriented Express Library to be built in the vicinity of the Metro station with the understanding that residents needing a "full service" library would use the Kensington Park or Rockville Libraries. In the event there is an increase in use at Kensington Park, the future renovation of the Kensington Park Library might require expansion of the building and parking.